

### **REMARKS/ARGUMENTS**

These remarks are made in response to the Office Action of October 17, 2008 (Office Action). As this response is timely filed within the 3-month shortened statutory period, no fee is believed due. However, the Examiner is expressly authorized to charge any deficiencies to Deposit Account No. 50-0951.

#### **Claims Rejections – 35 USC §§ 102 and 103**

In the Office Action, Claims 1-5, 13, 17, and 21 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Published Patent Application 2003/0046304 to Peskin, *et al.* (hereinafter Peskin). Claims 6-8 and 22-24 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Peskin in view of U.S. Patent 7,139,722 to Perrella, *et al.* (hereinafter Perrella). Claim 9 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Peskin in view of U.S. Published Patent Application 2004/0111309 to Matheson, *et al.* (hereinafter Matheson). Claims 10-12, 14, 15, and 26-28 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Peskin in view of U.S. Published Patent Application 2004/0220768 to Klein (hereinafter Klein). Claim 16 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Peskin in view of U.S. Published Patent Application 2001/0037229 to Jacobs, *et al.* (hereinafter Jacobs).

Although Applicants respectfully disagree with the rejections, Applicants have amended Claim 1. Applicants have cancelled Claims 3-4 and 10-29. However, Applicants are not conceding that the remaining claims as originally formulated or the cancelled claims fail to present patentable subject matter. The amendments and cancellations are solely for the purpose of expediting prosecution. Accordingly, neither the amendments nor cancellations should be interpreted as the surrender of any subject matter, and Applicants expressly reserve the right to present the original version of any of the amended claims in any future divisional or continuation applications from the present

application. As discussed herein, the claim amendments are fully supported throughout the Specification. No new matter has been introduced by the claim amendments.

**Aspects of Applicants' Invention**

It may be helpful to reiterate certain aspects of Applicants' invention prior to addressing the cited references. One embodiment of the invention, as typified by amended Claim 1, is a method for managing travel time of meeting participants within a scheduling application.

The method can include initializing the scheduling application; identifying a meeting and meeting participants, a meeting location and a meeting time for the meeting; determining an origination location for at least one meeting participant; and automatically computing a travel time for the participant based at least in part upon the meeting location and the origination location. The computing step includes constructing a location matrix comprising a plurality of location nodes; drawing a line segment between each pair of location nodes when travel is possible between the pair of location nodes; assigning a link weight to the line segment between the pair of location nodes, wherein the link weight is a value representing a travel time that connects the pair of location nodes; identifying a location node corresponding to the meeting location; identifying a location node corresponding to the originating location; and calculating the travel time based at least in part upon link weights of line segments between the originating location node and the meeting location node.

The method also can include upon receiving a travel condition, adjusting a corresponding link weight to account for the received travel condition and re-computing the travel time based on the adjusted link weight; calculating a suggested departure time based on the travel time; and presenting a meeting reminder to the meeting participant at some time before the suggested departure time.

See, e.g., Specification, paragraphs [0029] to [0032] and [0037] to [0039].

**The Claims Define Over The Prior Art**

Claim 1 has been amended to further recite a method of computing a travel time utilizing a location matrix. Applicants believe that this is not disclosed by any of the cited references or any combination thereof.

It was asserted on page 9 of the Office Action that Peskin teaches constructing a location matrix comprising a plurality of location nodes (Figure 3, x-y coordinates are location nodes). However, it is noted that Fig. 3 of Peskin only shows a location table, not a location matrix in the sense of the present invention. An example of a location matrix 205 is shown in Fig. 2A of the instant application.

It was stated in the Office Action that Peskin does not disclose connecting pairs of location nodes to each other; and assigning a link weight to each of the connections between the location nodes, wherein the location matrix is used to calculate the travel time. However, it was asserted that Klein teaches these limitations.

It is noted that Fig. 3 of Klein shows a planned route R from a current location S to a destination Z. This is totally different from connecting pairs of location nodes in a location matrix 205 to each other as shown in Fig. 2A of the instant application. In Klein the locations are not connected in pairs, but rather are connected one after another.

It is also noted that paragraph [0027] of Klein describes calculating a pedestrian route starting from the destination Z to the planned arrival point O (car park) taking into account of a walking speed. However, Klein does not disclose assigning a link weight to the line segment between the pair of location nodes, wherein the link weight is a value representing a travel time that connects the pair of location nodes, as recited in amended Claim 1 of the instant application.

Applicants further believe that none of the cited references discloses calculating the travel time based at least in part upon link weights of line segments between the originating location node and the meeting location node; and upon receiving a travel

condition, adjusting a corresponding link weight to account for the received travel condition and re-computing the travel time based on the adjusted link weight, as recited in amended Claim 1 of the instant application.

Accordingly, the cited references, alone or in combination, fail to disclose or suggest each and every element of Claim 1, as amended. Applicants therefore respectfully submit that amended Claim 1 defines over the prior art. Furthermore, as each of the remaining claims depends from Claim 1 while reciting additional features, Applicants further respectfully submit that the remaining claims likewise define over the prior art. Applicants thus respectfully request that the claim rejections under 35 U.S.C. §§ 102 & 103 be withdrawn.

### **CONCLUSION**

Applicants believe that this application is now in full condition for allowance, which action is respectfully requested. Applicants request that the Examiner call the undersigned if clarification is needed on any matter within this Amendment, or if the Examiner believes a telephone interview would expedite the prosecution of the subject application to completion.

Respectfully submitted,  
AKERMAN SENTERFITT

Date: November 25, 2008

/Gregory A. Nelson/  
Gregory A. Nelson, Registration No. 30,577  
Yonghong Chen, Registration No. 56,150  
Customer No. 40987  
Post Office Box 3188  
West Palm Beach, FL 33402-3188  
Telephone: (561) 653-5000